

DRAFT
Area-Wide Soil Contamination Project
Work Group I – Geographic/Geochemical Assessment
Work Group Charter

Background

Soil in large areas of Washington State is contaminated with low-to-moderate levels of contaminants, including arsenic and lead, caused by a range of historical activities. As Washington's population has grown, many of these areas have been developed into residential neighborhoods, schools, and parks. These development activities have created pressures for cleanup and raised a variety of health, environmental, and marketplace concerns. The Departments of Ecology, Health, and Agriculture and the Office of Community Development have chartered a task force to address issues of area-wide soil contamination in Washington State. The Area-Wide Soil Contamination Task Force will work with two work groups and a consultant team to develop recommendations for the chartering agencies by June 2003 on a statewide strategy to respond to area-wide soil contamination problems.

The project will study the nature and geographic extent of area-wide soil contamination in Washington, identify feasible measures to protect human health and the environment, and recommend institutional and/or regulatory changes to improve how area-wide soil contamination problems are addressed. During the course of the project, the Agencies and the consultant team will also develop and implement a public involvement plan to educate the public and provide opportunities for public participation in the project.

The Charge to the Work Group

The Work Group is being created to advise the four agencies on the identification and quantification of the area-wide soil contamination problems posed by arsenic and lead. Specifically, the Work Group is being asked to provide recommendations on the following questions:

- What is the nature and extent of the area-wide soil contamination problem in Washington State?
- What methods can local agencies or other organizations use to further define the nature and extent of area-wide soil contamination problems within their respective jurisdictions?
- What are appropriate methods for assessing the nature and extent of contamination problems at individual properties or projects?

Products

Work Group I will be supported by a contractor team selected for this project. The contractor team will produce a number of documents and other deliverables in support of and in collaboration with the Work Group. These documents are outlined in the attached Area-Wide Soil Contamination Project Scope of Work.

Assumptions

The Work Group will operate from the following assumptions:

- Cleanup Standards: The extent of the area-wide soil contamination problem in Washington is defined by the MTCA Cleanup Standards. Ecology has recently completed a five-year process to review and update those standards. Consequently, the Work Group is not being asked to review or provide recommendations on (1) cleanup standards for individual hazardous substances, (2) the risk policies underlying those standards, or (3) the technical methods used to establish the standards for arsenic and lead.
- Ground Water Protection: The project will focus on problems and solutions associated with low-to-moderate levels of widespread soil contamination. The project has been designed based on the assumption that ground water contamination problems are unlikely to be associated with the low-to-moderate concentrations of arsenic and lead.
- Relationship to Other Project Tasks and Task Force Deliberations: The reports and evaluations prepared by Work Group I will be provided to the Task Force for their consideration as they develop overall recommendations for the four agencies. As appropriate, the Work Group I report(s) will be integrated into the Task Force report and recommendations. In order to ensure that Work Group I's activities are fully integrated into the overall project, and to provide opportunities for stakeholder views represented by Task Force members to influence the scope and direction of Work Group I's work, the Task Force will be asked to review and provide comments on Work Group I's scope of work and interim products.
- Decision Making and Consensus: The overall goal is to develop Work Group products that represent the consensus of Work Group members. The desired consensus outcome is one in which all Work Group members support Work Group products. To the extent that full consensus is not reached, Work Group products will reflect the range of views across the Work Group.

Roles and Responsibilities

Work Group Members

Work Group members are responsible for participating in the identification, review, and analysis of options; coordinating input and ideas from organizations they represent; participating in Work Group discussions; and making recommendations for consideration by the four agencies and the Task Force.

Julie Wilson/Eric Weber–Task Managers

In addition to participating as a member of the Work Group, the Task Managers are responsible for managing and directing the technical staff preparing the various evaluations and reports. The Task Managers are responsible for organizing and facilitating the Work Group meetings.

Contractor Technical Team

Contractor technical team members are responsible for performing the evaluations and analyses assigned by the Task Managers. It is anticipated that technical team members will attend some (but not all) of the Work Group meetings. Membership on the technical team may evolve as Work Group needs and interests evolve. The initial members of the technical team are: Shannon Dunn, Paul Glenn, Anne Halverson, Pete Rude and Brian Christianson from Landau Associates; Greg Glass; Anne Bailey from EcoChem; Petty Williamson from Fulcrum; Kent Hale from Adolfson Associates; and Jay Manning from Marten Brown LLP.

Rick Roeder/Ann Wick–Agency Representatives

In addition to participating as members of the Work Group, the Agency Representatives are responsible for forming the Work Group, working with the Task Manager to identify evolving resource needs that might require contract modifications, and providing backup facilitation support.

Elizabeth McManus–Task Force and Work Group Coordination

Attend work group meetings as budgeting allows to facilitate coordination between work groups and the Task Force on development of information and deliverables. Conduct state surveys with questions developed by technical staff.

Dawn Hooper

Agency Task Force and Work Group Coordination. Attend work group meetings as time allows to facilitate coordination between work groups and the Task Force on development of information and deliverables.

Schedule

It is anticipated that the Work Group will hold six meetings between January and December 2002 as follows.

Meeting #1 (week of February 25)

- What is being done in the information survey (subtask 3.3)
- Purpose of sampling design subgroup relative to the work group and progress to date (subtask 3.6)

- Progress on the sampling guidance document (subtask 3.10) and provide draft for review and comment
- Approach to be used for the confirmation sampling SAP/QAPP/HASP and work assignments
- Approach that will be used, progress to date, and work assignments on preliminary estimates (subtask 3.4)

Meeting #2 (week of April 15)

- Results of the information survey (subtask 3.3)
- Confirmation sampling study design memorandum (subtask 3.6)
- Draft sampling guidance
- Progress to date on the SAP/QAPP/HSP for confirmation sampling (subtask 3.6)
- Draft sampling guidance (subtask 3.10)
- Progress on preliminary estimates (subtask 3.4)

Meeting #3 (week of May 20)

- Draft preliminary estimates results (subtask 3.4)
- Review progress of sampling
- Summarize upcoming deliverables and work assignments for fall

Meeting #4 (week of August 26)

- Final preliminary estimates results (subtask 3.4)
- Summarize confirmation sampling work and preliminary results (if available)
- Draft pilot project report (subtask 3.7)
- Work assignments for tools documents (subtask 3.8)
- Work assignments for regional background document (subtask 3.9)

Meeting #5 (sometime between September 23 and October 21)

- Draft pilot project report (subtask 3.7)
- Draft tools document (subtask 3.8)
- Draft background document (subtask 3.9)
- Outline for Work Group report

Meeting #6 (December 2002)

- Review draft Work Group report